

## REMARKS

Claims 1-63 were pending as of the Office Action mailed July 11, 2005. In a BPAI decision dated March 31, 2010, the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-33 was reversed. Additionally, the rejection of claims 34-38 and 40-63 was affirmed.

With respect to this response, claims 1-63 are pending. Additionally, claims 1-10, 12-32, 34-44, and 46-62 are being amended, claims 11, 33, 45, and 63 are being cancelled, and claims 64 and 65 are being newly added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found within the applicant's specification at least within page 7, lines 7-16 and page 18, lines 11-16. Additionally, new claims 64 and 65 include the limitations of claims 1 and 33, and 34 and 33, respectively.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing new claims and the following remarks.

### **Interview Summary**

The applicant thanks examiner Le for the courtesy of the in-person interview on April 20, 2010. The time spent with the applicant's representatives Tim Wilson, John Biernacki, Gary Kuhn, Robert Chu, and Arriènne M. Lezak was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the claims were discussed in view of the cited references. Recommendations were made by the examiner. These recommendations have been incorporated into the new claims as noted above.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 16, 17, 20-23, 25, 26, 30-38, 40-47, 50, 51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 61, and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,480,194 (“Sang’udi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,750,864 (“Anwar”).

Claims 14, 15, 48, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sang’udi and Anwar, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,185 (“Chickering”).

Claims 18, 19, 27, 28, 52, 53, 59, and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sang’udi and Anwar, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,526 (“Chaudhuri”).

Claims 24 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sang'udi and Anwar, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,798 (“Lawler”).

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sang'udi and Anwar, and in further view of “Indexing HTML files” (“Brown”).

Claim 63 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sang'udi and Anwar, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,719 (“Thomas”).

#### Claim1

To expedite prosecution, and in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, claim 1 has been amended as noted above. The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Sang'udi, Anwar, Chickering, Chaudhuri, Lawler, Brown, and Thomas, alone or in combination, do not teach or describe each and every element recited in claim 1. Thus, the applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 34 recites features corresponding to those of claim 1 and stands rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claim 34 is allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

#### Remaining Claims

Claims 2-10 and 12-32 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to that independent claim. Claims 35-44 and 46-62 depend from claim 34 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to that independent claim.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

#### New Claims 64 and 65

Support for new claims 64 and 65 is noted above. The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Sang'udi, Anwar, Chickering, Chaudhuri, Lawler, Brown, and Thomas, alone or in combination, do not teach or describe each and every element recited in new claims 64 and 65. Thus, the applicant submits that claims 64 and 65 are allowable.

### Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-1432, Reference No. 343355-600020.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 1, 2010

By: /Arriènne M. Lezak/  
Arriènne M. Lezak  
Reg. No. 51,943  
JONES DAY  
1755 Embarcadero Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
(650) 687-4163